

The combination of Nanki et al. and Senoh does not suggest a method of accessing a video and/or audio program by receiving a request signal to access a video and/or audio program among the video and/or audio programs stored in the apparatus, displaying a program list comprising information regarding the program and an image corresponding to each of the programs and accessing the video and/or audio program based on a selection made in the display screen from the program list as in the claimed invention. Nanki et al. is directed to an apparatus for receiving a digital broadcasting where service information is provided to the user or where the service information cannot be obtained in the broadcasting. As disclosed in paragraph 0016, Nanki et al. discloses a recording medium in which there are recorded service information where the amount of the service information is larger than that of the service information transmitted by the digital broadcasting in a digital broadcasting reception apparatus.

As disclosed in paragraph 0019 of Nanki et al., a DVD is used as a recording medium or service information containing program information of broadcasting for one month are recorded on the recording medium. In this manner, the user is able to obtain information which cannot be obtained only by the received service information. Thus, Nanki et al. is directed to an apparatus where the broadcast information can be viewed based on the future date and time of the broadcast for viewing and/or recording. The user selects a desired program on the program guide displayed on the screen. The processing unit extracts the information necessary for the selected program such as a program broadcasting start time as disclosed in paragraph 0046. The display screen of Nanki et al. displays a calendar to display the information according to the day and time. See, for example, paragraph 0062.

The Action refers to paragraph 0063 of Nanki et al. for selecting a program. However, Nanki et al. does not select a program and does not access a video and/or audio program stored in the system based on a selection made in the display screen from a program list as in the claimed invention. Thus, Nanki et al. does not receive a request signal to access video and/or

audio programs among programs stored in the video and/or audio recording/reproducing apparatus as in the present invention. Instead, Nanki et al. selects programs based on a broadcasting schedule.

Senoh also does not disclose the features of the independent claims of the present invention. The Action refers to paragraph 0122 of Senoh as allegedly disclosing a list comprising an image corresponding to the video and/or audio programs. This passage of Senoh refers to the recording and playback system being selected in an editing mode and reads the program information from the program manager file. Senoh does not disclose the step of displaying a program list comprising information regarding video and/or audio programs and an image corresponding to each of the video and/or audio programs. Furthermore, Senoh does not suggest displaying a program list of programs stored in the recording/reproducing apparatus and thereafter accessing the program based on the selection made in the display.

It would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Nanki et al. according to Senoh in the manner suggested in the Action. Furthermore, since Nanki et al. refers only to program information of a program to be broadcast, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide an editing mode which reads program information from a program manager as in Senoh. Even if one were to combine the teachings of Senoh with Nanki et al., the resulting method and apparatus would not display a program listing comprising information of the program and an image corresponding to each of the programs from a plurality of programs stored in the apparatus and thereafter accessing the selected program from the stored programs based on the display screen displaying the program list. Accordingly, independent claim 21 is not obvious over the combination of Nanki et al. and Senoh. Independent claims 37, 47, 53 and 69 are also not obvious for the reasons advanced with respect to claim 21.

The dependent claims are also allowable as depending from an allowable base claim and for reciting additional features of the invention. The cited patents do not disclose displaying the

program list as defined in claim 24, the apparatus receiving a program from a plurality of program sources as in claim 32, the program stored in the storage device as in claim 33, the request signal receiving the signal from an external input device as in claim 34, the programs being compressed in a predetermined compression format as in claim 35, and the compression format being an MPEG compression format as in claim 36, in combination with the features of claim 21. The cited patents also do not disclose displaying the information by outputting a signal as in claim 38, displaying the information as in claim 39, the information as defined in claim 40, the compression format of claim 43, in combination with the features of claim 37. Claims 48, 52, 56, 62, 64-66, 70-72, 75, 77-80, 83 and 84 are allowable for the same reasons and for depending from an allowable base claim.

In view of the above comments, the claims are allowable over the combination of Nanki et al. and Senoh.

B. Claims 22, 25, 42, 54, 74, 91 and 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nanki et al. in view of Senoh and U.S. Patent No. 7,434,245 to Shiga et al. Shiga et al. is cited for displaying a still image and text data.

Shiga et al. does not suggest a still image corresponding to a video and/or audio program in a program list display comprising information of the programs stored in a video and/or audio recording/reproducing apparatus as in the claimed invention. Shiga et al. further fails to disclose accessing a video and/or audio program based on a selection in the display screen from the programs stored in the apparatus.

Shiga et al. refers to programs that are being transmitted over the broadcast channel and received by a tuner. The images referred to in Shiga et al. correspond to the program being received by the broadcast channel and are superimposed over a normal size picture image. The displayed image does not correspond to a program stored in the apparatus and does not enable selection of a program from the apparatus. The images represent the programs that are currently

being transmitted on the broadcast channels including all of the programs currently being transmitted on all of the broadcast channels and those which will be transmitted over a given period of time. See, for example, column 8, lines 16-21.

In view of the deficiencies of Shiga et al., it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the apparatus of Nanki et al. and Senoh to include a still image corresponding to a program stored in a video and/or audio recording/reproducing apparatus as in the claimed invention. Accordingly, claims 22, 25, 42, 54, 74, 91 and 92 are not obvious over the combination of Nanki et al. in view Senoh and Shiga et al.

C. Claims 23, 26-28 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nanki et al. in view of Senoh, Shiga et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,020,930 to Legrand.

Legrand also relates to a broadcast system and displaying a broadcast system program guide. The multichannel broadcasting system includes a program guide for the user to select channels for viewing. The program guide displays a representative video frame for the programs corresponding to the broadcasting channels but does not disclose or suggest a method or apparatus for accessing video and/or audio programs stored in a recording/reproducing apparatus as in the claimed invention. The broadcasting system of Legrand has no relation to the method or apparatus of Nanki et al. and Senoh. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method and apparatus of Nanki et al., Senoh and Shiga et al. to include a still image of programs stored in the apparatus.

Legrand does not disclose displaying information comprising one or more of the title information, recording date information and reproducing time in response to a selection of a corresponding image being displayed. Legrand instead discloses a display having certain information and image but does not suggest selecting an image and displaying the information corresponding to the selected image. Accordingly, claims 23, 26-28 and 55 are not obvious over the combination of Nanki et al., Senoh, Shiga et al. and Legrand.

D. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nanki et al. in view of Senoh, Shiga et al., Legrand, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0237108 to Drazin et al. Drazin et al. is cited for disclosing arranging information in chronological order.

For the reasons discussed above, the primary references do not disclose or suggest displaying information and image data corresponding to each program stored in the recording/reproducing apparatus and selecting the program based on the display screen. Thus, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to arrange the display screen in order of date based on the disclosure of Drazin et al.

E. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nanki et al. in view of Senoh, Shiga et al., Legrand, and U.S. Patent No. 5,793,364 to Bolanos et al.

Bolanos et al. refers to a screen 10 having a still image window for displaying an image corresponding to the audio/visual program identified by the current position of the selection bar 14. The image changes with the movement of the selection bar in the device of Bolanos et al. There is no suggestion of displaying an image corresponding to each of the video and/or audio programs with the corresponding information of the programs that are stored in the apparatus.

It would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method and apparatus of Nanki et al., Senoh, Shiga et al. and Legrand to include the image suggested in Bolanos et al. Accordingly, claim 30 is not obvious over the combination of the cited patents.

F. Claims 41 and 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nanki et al. in view of Senoh and Bolanos et al.

Bolanos et al. does not disclose or suggest a request signal to edit information corresponding to the video and/or audio program stored in the apparatus and displaying an

input screen to facilitate editing of the information as in claims 41 and 73. Accordingly, the claims are not obvious over the combination of Nanki et al., Senoh and Bolanos et al.

G. Claims 31, 63 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nanki et al. in view of Senoh and U.S. Patent No. 6,396,998 to Nozaki et al. Nozaki et al. is cited for disclosing a DVD recording and reproducing apparatus comprising information recorded on a first disk and copies of the reproduced information on another DVD RAM disk. For the reasons discussed above, Nanki et al. and Senoh do not disclose the method of independent claim 1. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method or apparatus of Nanki et al. to include a combination device including a storage device, a recording/reproducing unit to record and reproduce a video and/or audio program with respect to the storage device and an optical disk recording and/or reproducing unit to record and/or reproduce a video and/or audio program as in claims 31, 63 and 76. Accordingly, these claims are not obvious over the combination of the cited patents.

H. Claims 10-46, 49-51, 68, 80, 81 and 85-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nanki et al. in view of Senoh, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0227485 to Krakirian et al. Krakirian et al. is cited for disclosing a menu comprising one or more digital recorder jukebox player and photo album submenus. The Action provides no basis for the position that it would have been obvious to modify the method and apparatus of Nanki et al. Senoh to include the menu display of Krakirian et al. Furthermore, Krakirian et al. does not suggest displaying the menu and submenus corresponding to the functions of the video recording/reproducing apparatus of claim 44 in combination with the features of the independent claims. Accordingly, these claims are not obvious over the combination of Nanki et al., Senoh and Krakirian et al.

I. Claims 57-59 and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nanki et al. in view of Senoh and Legrand.

For the reasons discussed above, Legrand does not disclose a program list comprising information regarding video and/or audio programs in a predetermined order and images corresponding to the respective video and/or audio programs stored in the apparatus. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method and apparatus of Nanki et al. and Senoh to arrange the program list and images corresponding to the stored programs as in claims 57-59 and 90. Accordingly, the claims are not obvious over the combination of the cited patents.

J. Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nanki et al. in view of Senoh, Legrand and Drazin et al. or Bolanos et al. Drazin et al. and Bolanos et al. do not suggest the information of the programs comprising recording date information and the recording date information being displayed from the earliest recording date to the latest recording date of programs stored in the apparatus. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method and apparatus of Nanki et al., Senoh and Legrand in view of Drazin et al. or Bolanos et al.


K. Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nanki et al. in view of Senoh, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0127887 to Yap et al., Nozaki et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,857,059 to Yamagishi and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0101282 to Kuroda. Each of the cited patents are cited as allegedly disclosing at least one of the components of the apparatus recited in claim 67.

The Action provides no basis for the position that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the selected components of each of the cited patents and combine them in a manner of the claimed invention. Furthermore, the Action provides no basis for the position that it would have been obvious to combine each of the recited elements of the apparatus of claim 67 in combination with the apparatus of independent claim 53. For the reasons discussed above, Nanki et al. and Senoh do not disclose or suggest the apparatus of

independent claim 53. Accordingly, claim 67, which depends from claim 53, is allowable over the art of record.

In view of the above comments and the deficiencies of the art of record, the claims are submitted to be allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Garrett V. Davis
Reg. No. 32,023

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9076

Dated: Feb 26, 2009